REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination in response to the Final Office Action mailed Dec. 19, 2007. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the below discussion.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the case.

Claim 1 has been amended to better claim the invention.

Claims 22-27 have been added. The Applicant respectfully urges that these claims contain additional novel features not suggested by the prior art of record.

Response to Examiner's Remarks

At page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner suggests that claim 1 does not recite positive limitations due to usage of the phrase "configured to." While the Applicant respectfully disagrees, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of the case, the Applicant has amended claim 1 so it no longer uses that phasing. The Applicant respectfully urges that claim 1 now makes clear that the limitation are positive and are entitled to patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

At pages 3-8 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Norman et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,054,311 (hereinafter "Norman") in view of Crump, U.S. Patent No 6,999,454 (hereinafter "Crump").

The Applicant's amended claim 1, representative in part of the other rejected claims, sets forth (emphasis added):

> 1. A distributed software architecture system configured to implement a routing protocol in a router of a computer network, the system comprising:
> a plurality of processors;
> a switch fabric interconnecting the processors; and
> ***a plurality of processes each running on a different one of the processors, the processes including two or more speakers*** and a protocol routing information base (RIB), ***each speaker to operate independently to*** (i) handle one or more connections to peer routers of the router, (ii) re-

> ceive and store routes from those peer routers, ***(iii) apply inbound policy to the routes received from the peer routers and (iv) download all routes received from the peer routers, except those filtered by the inbound policy, to the protocol RIB***, the protocol RIB to perform a first stage of route selection to compute a set of best routes from among the routes downloaded from all of the speakers of the router.

Norman discloses a router with a distributed architecture. *See* abstract. Line cards (Fig. 1A, 104), having a processor (112) for low-level processing, receive packets from peers. Controller cards, that include a CPU 120, manage all routing related functions. The CPU on the controller card constructs a RIB and performs route selection in distributed memory (Fig. 1A,130X and 130Y). In one implementation, Norman describes splitting the routing functions of RIB analysis and FIB analysis into "two parallel processing problems" and assigning them to two CPU's (120_x, 120_y) on different controller cards (110_x, 110_y). *See* col. 11, lines 15-20 and 26-33 and 36-42.

Crump discloses a router where routing tables are distributed across a number of control processor CP cards and service termination (ST) cards. *See* col. 5, lines 58-59, and col. 6, lines 10-15. Differing portions of a routing table, and backup copies, are constructed and maintained by different cards. *See* Fig. 12, RT1, RT2, RT3 and also col. 8, line 8 to col. 9, line 60.

The Applicant respectfully urges that both Norman and Crump are silent concerning the Applicant's claimed "***processes each running on a different one of the processors, the processes including two or more speakers … each speaker to operate independently to… (iii) apply inbound policy to the routes received from the peer routers and (iv) download all routes received from the peer routers, except those filtered by the inbound policy, to the protocol RIB.***"

While Norman discusses the possibility of splitting RIB analysis and FIB analysis among CPU or controller cards, Norman makes no mention of multiple speakers on different processors that operate independently ***to apply inbound policy to the routes received*** from peers and ***download all routes received*** from peers to a protocol RIB. Indeed, the Examiner appears to at least partially agree that Norman does not teach multiple speakers on different processors with this functionality, stating "Norman does no explicitly indicate apply inbound policy to the routes received from the peer routers, filtering using the inbound policy to the protocol RIB." *See* Office Action pages 3-4.

The Office action then turns to Crump. However, Crump also does not suggest multiple speakers on different processors that operate independently ***to apply inbound policy to the routes received*** from peers and download all routes received from peers to a protocol RIB. The Office Action points to col. 11, lines 5-9 of Crump, which state:

> Continuing from CASE 1, the DRTM on ST 7 receives the Update Route message from ST 6 over the control bus (event 5). Because ST 7 does not maintain routing table RT1, the DRTM discards the Update Route message.

Here Crump simply describes that if an Update Route message is received at a service termination (ST) card that does not maintain a related routing table, (and thus has no use for the Update Route message) the Update Route message is discarded. This passage does not imply that routing policy is applied to filter routes in the Update Route message, the message is simply dropped.

Further, the Applicant respectfully urges that no other portion of Crump suggests multiple speakers on different processors that operate independently ***to apply inbound policy to the routes received*** from peers and download all routes received from peers to a protocol RIB.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Norman and Crump is legally insufficient to make obvious the present claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 because of the absence of the Applicant's claimed novel "***processes each running on a different one of the processors, the processes including two or more speakers … each speaker to operate independently to… (iii) apply inbound policy to the routes received from the peer routers and (iv) download all routes received from the peer routers, except those filtered by the inbound policy, to the protocol RIB.***"

At page 9 of the Final Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Norman and Crump in further view of Weyman, U.S. Patent Publication No 2005/0041665 (hereinafter "Weyman").

The Applicant notes that claim 10 is a dependent claim that depends from an independent claim believed to be allowable. Accordingly, claim 10 is also believed to be allowable due to such dependency as well as for other separate reasons.

Should the Examiner believe a telephonic interview would be helpful in the disposition of this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-2500.

In summary, all the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore all dependent claims that depend there from are believed to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully solicits favorable action.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

__/James A. Blanchette/__________
James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500